

# (Lack of) Visual Representation of Black Slaves in Spanish Golden Age Painting

Carmen Fracchia

Given that Seville was from the fifteenth century one of the most important markets for the slave trade in Western Europe, it is surprising that only a few paintings produced in Early Modern Spain pay any attention to the representation of black slaves in the Iberian Peninsula.<sup>1</sup> In Golden Age literature and drama the image of black people also started to become visible only from the second half of the sixteenth century in the works of Cervantes, Mateo Alemán and Lope de Vega (Fra Molinero 1995) while the invisibility of slaves, especially that of women in Golden Age archival material, has been recently tackled by Martín Casares (2000).

It is important to clarify that in this article the word *black* will be used as it was in Early Modern Spain to signify “slave”. This generic word includes the following racial categories recorded in contemporary documents: *negros* (Black people from sub-Saharan Africa), *berberiscos* (Berbers from North Africa, as well as Jews), *moriscos* (Iberian Muslims), but it excludes white slaves (mainly from Turkey). While the population of Morisco slaves declined from the middle of the sixteenth century, the number of slaves coming from North Africa and West sub-Saharan Africa increased throughout the seventeenth century.

In Early Modern Spain the black population of slaves and liberated slaves constitutes one of the visible social “Others” in society. Slavery of black and white people was obviously not a new phenomenon in Spain. It was introduced by the Carthaginians and it was developed by the Romans. It was only partially abolished in 1817 but never completely so. Slaves were some of the social pollutants who were necessary to the success of the Spanish Empire. It is interesting that from 1501 the Spanish Crown allowed only Christian black people to go to the New World as slaves, although there is documentary evidence that this restriction was not observed (Franco Silva 1979, p. 95).

Thus, it is intriguing that the visual representation of the visible black population, as we shall soon see, seems mainly to have been constructed by the painter Diego Velázquez (1599–1660) in Seville and Rome. Although the Sevillian painter Bar-

---

Correspondence to: Carmen Fracchia, Birkbeck College, University of London, School of Languages, Linguistics and Culture, 43 Gordon Square, Bloomsbury, London WC1H 0PD, UK.

tolomé Esteban Murillo depicted his own slave in his painting *Two Peasant Boys and a Negro Boy* (c. 1670; Dulwich Collection, London), I shall concentrate only on Velázquez, who gave greater attention to the subject. His depictions coexist with the equally marginal and still popular pre-modern representation of black people, which was mainly confined to religious paintings and sculpture.

The visibility of the black population in Early Modern Spain and particularly in Seville was indisputable. When Seville became the commercial capital of the Hapsburgs after the discovery of the New World and the creation, in 1503, of the Casa de Contratación to control trade, the obvious consequences were the accumulation of capital, a rapid increase in the city's population and its transformation into a cosmopolitan city by the existence of powerful foreign colonies. One of the commercial activities of these colonies was the slave trade. The wealthier slave dealers were responsible for the introduction of slaves or the "other foreigners" who stayed mostly on the fringes of Spanish society. Slave-traders were Sevillians, Portuguese, Genoese, Florentines, Catalans, Germans, French and English (Franco Silva 1979, pp. 73–103, 193). Most of the black slaves were captured in Africa, in present-day Guinea-Bissau, Guinea Conakry, Senegal, Gambia, part of Mali and part of Burkina by the Portuguese, who then exported their human cargo to Seville. It was mainly from this Spanish port that slaves were sold and sent to either Andalusia, Castile or the New World.

During the sixteenth century the slave population of Seville was the largest in Spain, owing to the demand for free labour in the New World and, as Antonio Domínguez Ortiz states (1971, p. 163), "to pander to the taste for luxury and refinement of the nobility and indeed the middle class who required large retinues of servants".<sup>2</sup> Spanish prices for this human cargo were apparently ahead of those of other European countries, and young women slaves from North Africa were considered the most valuable "goods".<sup>3</sup> The slave trade reached its peak at the end of the sixteenth century, when Seville became the main slave market in the Iberian Peninsula together with Lisbon and Valencia. Seville was the fourth biggest city in Western Europe with a population of 120,000, including approximately 30,000 slaves black and white, Muslim and Christian, although there was also a high proportion in Madrid, the seat of the court. During the seventeenth century, however, the slave trade began to decline, owing to a series of events that contributed to the gradual decrease of the population.<sup>4</sup>

Thus there is no doubt that in Early Modern Spain slavery was a visible, "natural", urban and domestic phenomenon associated with economic exploitation and social status. It is within this context that I would like to consider three oil paintings on canvas by Velázquez in order to grasp some of the complexities and contradictions of the rare representations of black people in seventeenth-century Spanish art. These works are: *Kitchen Maid with the Supper at Emmaus* (National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, 55 × 118 cm) (Figure 1); another version of the same painting, *Kitchen Scene* or *The Kitchen Maid* also known as *The Black Servant* or *The Mulatto Servant* (Art Institute, Chicago, 55 × 104 cm); and *Juan de Pareja* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 81.3 × 69.9 cm) (Figure 2).<sup>5</sup>



Figure 1 Diego Velázquez, *Kitchen Maid with Supper at Emmaus* (55 × 118 cm), Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland.

The two kitchen scenes were painted in Seville (c. 1618–19), at the beginning of the artist's career, before he left for Madrid in 1623 to work as a court painter to Philip IV; the portrait was executed in 1650, during the artist's second trip to Rome. It is interesting to note that these works also remained largely "invisible" since for the most part they were kept in private collections until the twentieth century and were only published and exhibited in 1913, 1927 and 1971 respectively.

Velázquez's paintings constitute a dramatic departure from the traditional representation of black people in Spanish painting. Since the Middle Ages their presence had been mainly confined to religious representations, as for example in the depiction of Hell, while in Early Modern Europe the first visual representation of the African was the Black Magus in the *Adoration of the Magi* (Devisse and Mollat 1979, pp. 161–253). In Spain, the black magus had been repeatedly represented since c. 1470 as an exotic figure sporting Oriental elements in his costume such as the turban or ostrich plumes (Wood 2000, pp. 217–218).<sup>6</sup> The black magus was obviously represented as divorced from his African context by most painters and sculptors in Golden Age Spain. These contradictory Early Modern representations of a black person indicate, in my opinion, an anxiety and ambivalent feelings towards the increasing visibility of the "African" in Europe.

In Velázquez's paintings we are faced with two different types of visual representation. In the kitchen scenes (see Figure 1) we see a female slave in a domestic setting, dressed in humble clothing and surrounded by objects that define her status. She is represented in the centre of the middle ground of the composition but having no engagement with the viewer since the angle of her gaze is lowered.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, in the *Pareja* portrait (see Figure 2), we have an elegantly dressed man, who occupies most of the canvas in the foreground and who addresses the spectator with no sense of fatigue and indeed with no accessories, which could define the profession of the man or distract the viewer from his powerful gaze.<sup>8</sup> The Dublin and Chicago



**Figure 2** Diego Velázquez, *Juan de Pareja* (81.3 × 69.9 cm), New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Purchase, Fletcher and Rogers Funds, and Bequest of Miss Adelaide Milton de Groot (1876–1967), by exchange, supplemented by gifts from friends of the Museum, 1971 (1971.86).

paintings follow the conventions of the *bodegón* (this term signifies the combination of still-life and *genre* in a tavern or kitchen scene), where lower class people and kitchen objects are represented, and as such the anonymity of the woman would be commonplace.<sup>9</sup> In the New York painting, however, the conventions of formal portraiture, restricted to the upper echelons of Spanish society, are applied and the man's particularity and identity are registered.

In the background of the Dublin kitchen scene (see Figure 1), at the top left of the painting, one can see the representation of two men at a table, which has been largely accepted as being the conventional religious depiction of the *Supper at Emmaus*. The absence of the second disciple who should have been sitting on the right is explained by the fact that this painting was cut down at the sides at an unrecorded date. Velázquez's distinctive northern pictorial device in the background was only revealed

in 1933, when the painting was cleaned, and it is not clear when this background was previously rendered invisible to the viewer (López Rey 1963, p. 127). The presence of this religious scene inside the Dublin painting led most art historians to the traditional interpretation of this work in the context of the salvation of the poor; thus the expression of the woman sitting at the table is seen as the effect of an “inner experience” of the miracle taking place in the dining room behind the kitchen. Velázquez is therefore thought to be an artist who is aware of the fact that salvation could reach every single person “irrespective of their social status or ethnic origin” (Davies and Harris 1996, p. 134).<sup>10</sup> This painting is historically viewed as a biblical *bodegón*, which as such would have been originally located in a guest room in a convent or monastery. In my opinion, however, this approach is limited in so far as it does not address the social, economic and historical dimension of slavery. One must not forget the personal and social implications of the contemporary mentality that denigrates slaves as “infeles y enemigos de nuestra santa religion catholica” (Franco Silva 1979, p. 37), and implicitly seeks to enforce their conversion.<sup>11</sup> This element of transformation was paramount for the slave’s integration into Spanish society, which also tried to regulate their behaviour partly through manuals of conduct aimed at the government of households. Vicente Mexía (1566, p. fol. 241v) tackles the treatment of slaves according to their nature of conversion to Christianity:

Mas si fueran christianos, hanse de mirar con ellos que quando los señores riñeren con ellos: se escusen de deshonorarlos con el estado que primero tenian, llamandoles perros, moros, judios, ni cosa desta calidad, lo uno por la injuria que conesto se haze al baptismo: lo otro por la pena grande que ellos desto reciben.

The main issue in Velázquez’s representation is that the slave woman is and remains a domestic servant with absolutely no freedom and no remuneration. It is well documented that the great majority of slaves working as domestic servants in Andalusia were women. Thus, it is paramount to take into account, as Martín Casares does, that there was a fundamental difference between a domestic slave and a servant. While both were at the bottom of the social scale in terms of marginalization and exploitation, their means of reproduction and therefore of survival were different, as the servant was never auctioned or captured in wars (Martín Casares 2000, pp. 23–25).

The fact that the Chicago painting and most copies of both kitchen scenes do not display the religious background and instead give a greater focus and prominence to the slave at the centre of the composition suggests that the kitchen representation, as a non-religious scene, was a more popular image. In this sense, it seems to me that the non-religious Chicago representation goes against the concept of biblical *bodegón* that historically lies at the roots of the invention of the Dublin painting.

It is rather a pity that we know nothing yet of who commissioned these kitchen scenes, or their artistic functions. These factors would obviously have been crucial. It is known, however, that a slave’s and a servant’s treatment depended very much on the mentality and the economic and social position of their owner. Total

ownership of slaves who performed domestic service without remuneration was the chief element of the economy of most households in Golden Age urban Seville. Velázquez's slave in the kitchen was a commodity and as such economic investment was the primary issue at stake rather than her salvation.

It is obvious that very often slave owners belonged to the monarchy, the aristocracy and the high clergy, including the Archbishop of Seville. The upper echelons of society purchased slaves through their intermediaries, whereas the rest of the social strata, such as professionals and artisans, dealt with the transaction directly, as documents of sale, purchase, donation, declaration of escape and manumission of slaves testify. Monasteries and cloistered nunneries or *casas de emparedadas* also obtained their respective male and female slaves through inheritance from the families of monks and nuns; or through donations from the laity and ecclesiastics to hasten the salvation of their souls; or else through sale and purchase from the priors. The Church never opposed slavery and slave auctions held on the steps of the Cathedral were a common sight in Seville.<sup>12</sup> However, the Church by contrast was against the slavery of Spanish Christians. There were, in fact, two religious orders: the Trinitarians and Mercedarians (founded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries respectively) whose main aim was to free captive Christian slaves, especially in Africa (Martín Casares 2000, pp. 80–82).

It is also well known that the private domain of the house was one of the attributes and locations of womanhood in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.<sup>13</sup> Thus the house constitutes the main referent of domestic servitude. In the houses belonging to the Early Modern elite, service was organized hierarchically into *oficios mayores de la casa* (butler, footman, page) and *oficios menores de la casa* (servant, maid, coachman, gardener, cook, drudge). At the bottom of the hierarchy was a large number of slaves. While women slaves were traditionally confined to the most menial tasks in the kitchen or in the fields, female servants had a variety of tasks according to their hierarchical position in the household.<sup>14</sup> Thus the gap between a servant such as a butler and a slave was insurmountable (Martín Casares 2000, pp. 319–327).

The stereotype of the docile domestic slave in the Spanish historiography of slavery is denied by the documented confrontations between slaves and owners in Andalusia. Some mechanisms of control of the slave population were in fact set up by the absolutist state: the institution of the Santa Hermandad to punish crimes by slaves with drastic measures such as amputations of limbs and the foundation of exclusive black brotherhoods, Nuestra Señora de los Angeles and Nuestra Señora de la Piedad, to regulate their social activities such as public meetings, religious processions and *fiestas* (Franco Silva 1979; Verdi Webster 1998). It is clear that the dominant ideology in Early Modern Spain “asimilaba la población esclava a la más baja categoría social (‘la más baja casta’)” (Martín Casares 2000, p. 386).

Despite the fact that in the kitchen scenes Velázquez lowers the gaze of the anonymous woman of colour at the centre of the composition, he contextualizes her marginal existence by relegating her to her workplace, an oppressive shallow space at the right-hand edge of the painting. By directing the source of light to the slave's

exhausted face and hands, the painter allows his viewers a glance towards the type of domestic production without which the Spanish Golden Age elite could not have survived.

There is an intriguing description of the Chicago painting by the late Baroque painter and art writer, Antonio de Palomino, in his biography of Velázquez, which raises the issue of the slave's gender:

... se ve un tablero, que sirve de mesa, con un anafe, y encima una olla hirviendo, y tapada con un escudilla, que se ve la lumbre, las llamas y centellas vivamente; un perolillo estañado, una alcarraza, unos platos y escudillas, un jarro vidriado, un almirez con su mano y una cabeza de ajos junto a él; y en el muro se divisa colgada de una escarpia una esportilla con un trapo y otras baratijas; y por guarda de esto *un muchacho con una jarra en la mano, y en la cabeza una escofieta, con que representa con su villanísimo traje un sujeto muy ridículo y gracioso.* (Palomino 1947 [1724], III, p. 106, emphasis added)

Art historians argue convincingly that Palomino's description refers to the Chicago painting since the light reflected on the woman's face indicates that the portable stove, pot and flames, mentioned by him but not visible in the Dublin painting, would have been depicted precisely on the left where the canvas has been cut.

It is significant that Palomino's description of Velázquez's Chicago kitchen scene not only relegates the only lively figure at the centre of the composition to the last and least item of the list of objects but also ridicules the "male" servant's outfit. It is even more puzzling to read that, as late as in 1990, it is still claimed that "el sexo de la supuesta mulata no está bien definido" (Gállego *et al.* 1990, p. 61). The only explanation is that either the painting had not been examined or, if it had been, the preference was to carry on making Velázquez's slave invisible by giving greater authority to the expressed Early Modern ambiguity, formulated by Palomino. Such bizarre gender confusion seems to express an underlining anxiety towards the "Other" in Early Modern Spain. In my opinion it suggests that the representation of the *mulata* might have fallen into the categories of the freak show or one of the wonders of the world.

The confusion surrounding the slave's ethnic origin is also significant: the variety of titles given to the Chicago kitchen scene define the anonymous woman as "black" or "mulatto", while she is considered by Barry Wind (1987, pp. 96–97) to be a "moor". Interestingly, this issue is partly avoided in the case of the portrait depicting *Juan de Pareja* (see Figure 2) by the acknowledgment of the name of the man represented in the title of Velázquez's work. This does not imply that Pareja was not perceived as the "Other", as Palomino's definition of the slave of mixed race clearly indicates: "de generación mestizo y de color extraño" (1947, III, p. 128). According to Martín Casares (2000, pp. 157–161), this is one of the biological definitions for the mulatto category in Spain. Documentary evidence shows that most of the mulatto or mixed-race populations were born in Spain or else in Portugal, in countries in North Africa and in the New World. In this sense, it is a surprise that the art writer Palomino dedicated a brief biography to Pareja (c.1605/6–1670) as a painter. The explanation undoubtedly was that Pareja was none other than Ve-

lázquez's own slave.<sup>15</sup> Velázquez followed the trend of his times, since until the end of the seventeenth century painters, who belonged to the social category of artisans, acquired slaves for free labour and to teach them their trade.<sup>16</sup> Palomino declared that Velázquez would in fact, only have allowed him to “moler los colores y aparejar algún lienzo, y otras cosas ministeriales del arte y de la casa” (1947, III, p. 128).

There is no doubt that Velázquez's slave was baptized and that he adopted the name Juan, which was one of the typical names taken from the kings of Spain and given to slaves after their conversion to Catholicism. Pareja was certainly not a *bozal*, an enslaved person, generally from sub-Saharan Africa, who would have recently arrived in Spain, but a *ladino*, a slave who assimilated to his owners' language and customs, and one of the very few who learnt to read and write (Martín Casares 2000, p. 156). This is obviously an exception if one considers that the majority of the population was illiterate. Pareja belongs to the category of slaves who, paradoxically, according to Domínguez Ortiz, “survived to become trusted counsellors of their masters” (1971, p. 164). In fact, as a reward Velázquez granted freedom to Pareja in Rome on 23 November 1650, after carrying out the superb portrait of his slave (Montagu 1983, p. 683). Such provision was by no means uncommon in acts of liberation and slaves were asked to purchase their freedom by further years of service. Thus, unsurprisingly, Pareja continued to serve his master and after Velázquez's death in 1660 he worked for his son-in-law, the painter Juan Bautista Mazo, at the court in Madrid. I believe that Pareja's act of freedom in Rome is significant since manumission was not very common in Spain (Martín Casares 2000, pp. 435–469). Freedom from slavery could only be obtained either by documents of freedom or *cartas de ahorrias* or by following the owner's wish expressed in his will. Since the economic cost of liberation was more expensive than the purchase of a slave, a document of freedom could mainly be obtained with the help of the slave's own family. Only captive Moors from Granada and Málaga and from North Africa were successful, not so slaves from Africa, or *indios* from the New World or slaves from the Canary Islands (Franco Silva 1979, pp. 243–246).

When we look at Velázquez's *Juan de Pareja* (see Figure 2), we realize that what we have before our eyes is a representation of a black man with the traditional paraphernalia of formal portraiture traditionally associated with the representation of the Spanish elite, a nobleman, a cleric or a statesman. Pareja's half-length is magnificently clothed with dark colours against a dark background so that the light leads the viewer straight to his gripping gaze, his dignified gesture and expression. Gállego described this portrait as:

... señorialmente vestido, con la rica valona de encaje de Flandes (que estaba prohibida en España hasta a los súbditos libres y que hasta Felipe IV evitaba, en pro de la austeridad de las costumbres) y la firmeza casi desafiante de su mirada, incluso la banda o tahalí que cruza su pecho, acentúan ese carácter casi guerrero. (1990, p. 391)

Palomino gives an interesting explanation of Velázquez's primary intention in constructing the image of a slave as a white European nobleman:

Cuando [Velázquez] se determinó retratarse al Sumo Pontífice, quiso prevenirse antes

con el ejercicio de pintar una cabeza del natural; hizo la de Juan de Pareja, esclavo suyo, y agudo pintor, tan semejante, y con tanta viveza, que habiéndolo enviado con el mismo Pareja a la censura de algunos amigos, se quedaban mirando el retrato pintado, y al original, con admiración y asombro, sin saber con quién habían de hablar, o quién les había de responder. (1947, III, p. 106)

Thus this painting was carried out as an exercise before Velázquez embarked on the portrait of Pope Innocent X, now in the Doria-Pamphili Gallery in Rome.<sup>17</sup> The reward of Pareja's new freedom meant that he was allowed to become a painter in his own right.<sup>18</sup> In his artistic career, Pareja decided to include his self-portrait in a large religious oil painting, *The Calling of St. Matthew* (Prado Museum, 225 × 325 cm). Significantly he stands on the left-hand margin of his composition, and he documents his authorship by holding a piece of paper which is signed and dated "1661", one year after Velázquez's death. Pareja makes himself doubly visible to the viewer by engaging us with his powerful although marginal gaze. The most notable issue, however, is that in his self-portrait Pareja follows Velázquez's construction of him as a nobleman, with the difference that the slave chooses to represent himself as a man of pale complexion. Pareja's hairstyle, moustache and beard are even resonant of Velázquez's self-portrait in *Las Meninas* (Prado Museum). It goes without saying that these visual paradigms signify the means by which Pareja had to assimilate in order to be accepted by the establishment. At the same time, these representations offer us a glance into the limited and often unthinkable possibilities that were open to slaves at the seat of the powerful Spanish Empire.

Both the Velázquez portrait of Juan de Pareja and Pareja's own self-portrait show some fundamental contradictions, which open up a series of questions on the choice of accepting and subverting the canon and the pictorial conventions of the time.

Despite the minimal material evidence of the pictorial representation of black slaves in Golden Age Spain, we could argue that the visual language and imagery adopted by Velázquez and by his slave Pareja give us a glimpse into the complexities of the representation of the black population in Early Modern Spain. They provide the viewer with an intriguing visual construction of the most invisible sector of the Spanish population during the seventeenth century.

### **Acknowledgements**

This article is based on a paper read to the Association of Hispanists of Great Britain and Ireland in Canterbury, University of Kent, 2000. The author is grateful to Isabel Santaolalla for inviting her to give this paper and for sharing her enthusiasm with her research. She would also like to thank Peter Abrahams and Barry Taylor for their generous help.

### **Notes**

- [1] See the comprehensive work on Spanish slavery by the historian Franco Silva (1979) based on ground-breaking publications by Charles Verlinden, Antonio Domínguez Ortiz, Vicenta

- Cortés Alonso and Jacques Heers. For the most updated historiography of the study of slavery in Early Modern Spain from a regional perspective, see the excellent work by Martín Casares (2000).
- [2] See also Pike (1972, pp. 143–144).
- [3] See Martín Casares (2000, Chapter 5).
- [4] See Domínguez Ortiz in Morales *et al.* (eds), II (1999, pp. 20–21). See also Domínguez Ortiz (1960, pp. 220–222; 1971, pp. 162–172, and 1987, pp. 245–261). Some of the events responsible for the dramatic decrease of the population were the expulsion of over 30,000 *moriscos* from 1609 to 1614; the death of 46% of the population as a result of the 1640 plague; and the loss of Portugal. See also Perry (1993, pp. 12–13).
- [5] For the history of the kitchen paintings, see López Rey (1963, pp. 33, 127–128; 1996, pp. 33, 38, 41); Mulcahy (1988, pp. 79–82); Davies and Harris (1996, pp. 134); Morales *et al.* (eds), II (1999, pp. 88–91, 112–133, 118–119). For the portrait of Pareja, see Rousseau (1971, pp. 448–78) and Brown (1986, p. 202).
- [6] For example the *Adoration of the Magi* (Prado Museum), executed by Velázquez in 1619. According to Devisse and Mollat (1979, pp. 134, 156, 161–164), the black associated with the Orient was already an iconographic commonplace in France and Germany before it appeared in Spain *c.* 1470, in the central panel of the *Adoration of the Magi* triptych by Hans Memling on the altar of Charles V's chapel in the castle of Aceca, near Aranjuez, now in the Museo del Prado, Madrid. See also Wood 2000. pp. 217–218.
- [7] On the concept of the role and power of the gaze in visual representations see Bryson (1983). See also his analysis of the overlooked in Spanish paintings. (1990).
- [8] On the cultural functions of portraiture see Leppert (1996) and Brilliant (1991).
- [9] See Velázquez's *bodegones* such as *Lunch*, the *Waterseller*, and *Old Woman Frying Eggs*.
- [10] See Morales *et al.* (eds), II (1999, pp. 77–91, 118–123).
- [11] For Golden Age political thought, see Martín Casares (2000, Chapter 2).
- [12] See Franco Silva (1979, p. 253); Perry (1993, pp. 86, 290–292); Martín Casares (2000, pp. 313–318).
- [13] See Perry (1993, pp. 73–74); Margarita Ortega and Rosa M. Capel in Aguado *et al.* (eds) (1994); Vigil (1994).
- [14] For the nature of jobs carried out by female servants, their recruitment and treatment, and for the conditions demanded of their owners, see Margarita Ortega and Rosa M. Capel in Aguado *et al.* (eds) (1994, p. 269).
- [15] New documents dismiss Palomino's claim that Pareja was born in Seville. He was born in Antequera in the province of Málaga *c.* 1605–06 and died in Madrid in 1670. See Montagu (1983, pp. 683–685).
- [16] See Franco Silva (1979, pp. 300–302); Sánchez Quevedo and Morán Turina (1999, pp. 104–105); Gállego *et al.* (eds) (1990, p. 387). Most painters owned one or two slaves: e.g. Alejo Fernández (*c.* 1475–1545), who was also a slave-trader; the court painter and art writer Vicente Carducho (*c.* 1576/8–1638); Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617/18–82), and the art writer and painter Francisco Pacheco (1564–1644), who was Velázquez's father-in-law.
- [17] For the analysis of this legend, see Stoichita (1999, pp. 367–381) and my forthcoming article, "Velázquez's Black Leg: Juan de Pareja and the Hardest Graft of All".
- [18] Some of the paintings by the slave-painter are recorded. See Palomino (1947, III, p. 128); Gaya Nuño (1957, pp. 271–285).

## References

- Aguado, A. M. *et al.* (eds) (1994) *Textos para la historia de las mujeres en España*, Cátedra, Madrid.
- Brilliant, R. (1991) *Portraiture*, Reaktion, London.
- Brown, J. (1986) *Velázquez: Painter and Courtier*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London.

- Bryson, N. (1983) *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*, Macmillan, London.
- Bryson, N. (1990) *Looking at the Overlooked: Four Essays on Still Life Paintings*, Reaktion, London.
- Cortés Alonso, V. (1964) *La esclavitud en Valencia durante el reinado de los Reyes Católicos*, Ayuntamiento, Valencia.
- Davies, D. & Harris, E. (eds) (1996) *Velázquez in Seville*, National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh.
- Devisse, J. & Mollat, M. (eds) (1979) *The Image of the Black in Western Art*, II, Office du Livre, Menil Foundation, Lausanne.
- Domínguez Ortiz, A. (1960) *Política y hacienda de Felipe IV*, Editorial de Derecho Financiero, Madrid.
- Domínguez Ortiz, A. (1971) *The Golden Age of Spain: 1516–1619*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, London.
- Domínguez Ortiz, A. (1987) *Los extranjeros en la vida española durante el siglo XVII y otros artículos*, Diputación de Sevilla, Seville.
- Fra Molinero, B. (1995) *La imagen de los negros en el teatro del Siglo de Oro*, Siglo XXI de España, Madrid.
- Franco Silva, A. (1979) *La esclavitud en Sevilla y su tierra a fines de la Edad Media*, Diputación Provincial de Sevilla, Seville.
- Gállego, J. et al. (eds) (1990) *Velázquez*, Museo del Prado, Madrid.
- Gaya Nuño, J. A. (1957) 'Revisiones sexcentistas: Juan de Pareja', *Archivo Español de Arte*, vol. 30, pp. 271–285.
- Heers, J. (1974) *Le clan Familial au Moyen Age*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Leppert, R. (1996) *Art and the Committed Eye: The Cultural Functions of Imagery*, Westview, Oxford.
- López Rey, J. (1963) *Velázquez: A Catalogue Raisonné of his Oeuvre*, Faber & Faber, London.
- López Rey, J. (1996) *Velázquez: Painter of Painters*, Taschen, Cologne.
- Martín Casares, A. (2000) *La esclavitud en la Granada del siglo XVI: Género, raza y religión*, Editorial Universidad de Granada, Diputación Provincial de Granada, Granada.
- Mexía, V. (1566) *Saludable instrucción del estado del matrimonio*, Juan Baptista Escudero, Córdoba.
- Montagu, J. (1983) 'Velázquez Marginalia: His slave Juan de Pareja and his illegitimate son Antonio', *Burlington Magazine*, vol. 125, pp. 683–685.
- Morales, A. J. et al. (1999) *Velázquez y Sevilla: Catálogo*, I, Aldeasa, Seville.
- Morales, A. J. et al. (1999) *Velázquez y Sevilla: Estudios*, II, Aldeasa, Seville.
- Mulcahy, R. (1988) *Spanish Paintings in the National Gallery of Ireland*, National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin.
- Palomino de Castro y Velasco, A. (1947 [1724]) *El Museo Pictórico y Escala Optica*, III, Aguilar, Madrid.
- Perry, M. E. (1993) *Ni espada rota ni mujer que trota. Mujer y desorden social en la Sevilla del Siglo de Oro*, trans. M. Fortuny Minguella, Crítica, Barcelona.
- Pike, R. (1972) *Aristocrats and Traders: Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Rousseau, T. (1971) 'Juan de Pareja by Diego Velázquez: an appreciation of the portrait', *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. 29, pp. 449–451.
- Sánchez Quevedo, I. & Morán Turina, M. (1999) *Pintura y sociedad en la España de Velázquez*, Akal, Madrid.
- Stoichita, V. I. (1999) 'El retrato del esclavo Juan de Pareja: Semejanza y conceptismo', in Fundación Amigos del Prado (eds), *Velázquez*, Galaxia Gutemberg, Barcelona.
- Verdi Webster, S. (1998) *Art and Ritual in Golden-Age Spain: Sevillian Confraternities and the Processional Sculpture of Holy Week*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Verlinden, C. (1955) *L'Esclavage dans l'Europe Médiévale*, Peninsule Iberique, France, I, Bruges.
- Vigil, M. (1994) *La vida de las mujeres en los siglos XVI y XVII*, Siglo XXI, Madrid [first published in 1986].

- Wind, B. (1987) *Velázquez's Bodegones: A Study in Seventeenth-Century Spanish Genre Painting*, George Mason University Press, London.
- Wood, M. (2000) *Blind Memory: Visual Representations of Slavery in England and America: 1780–1865*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.